1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (Boston)
3	No. 1:20-cr-10098-WGY-3
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
6	
7	vs.
8	
9	STEPHANIE STOCKWELL
10	
11	*****
12	
13	For Hearing Before:
14	Judge William G. Young
15	Sentencing
16	
17	United States District Court District of Massachusetts (Boston.)
18	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210
19	Tuesday, October 11, 2022
20	* * * * * *
21	
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
25	

```
APPEARANCES
1
 2
 3
    SETH B. KOSTO, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
 4
       One Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3230
 5
       E-mail: Seth.kosto@usdoj.gov
 6
       For the United States of America
 7
8
    GAIL SHIFMAN, ESQ.
       Law Office of Gail Shifman
       2431 Fillmore Street
 9
       San Francisco, California 94115
10
       (415) 551-1500
       Email: Gail@shifmangroup.com
11
       for the defendant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
           (Begins, 10:30 a.m.)
 3
           THE CLERK: Now hearing Criminal Matter 20-10098,
     the United States of America versus Stephanie Stockwell.
 4
 5
           THE COURT: Now good morning. This is a
     sentencing under 18 United States Code Section 3553(a),
 6
     and would counsel please identify themselves. We'll
8
     start with the government.
           MR. KOSTO: Good morning, your Honor, Assistant
 9
10
     United States Attorney Seth Kosto appearing on behalf of
11
     the government.
12
           MS. SHIFMAN: Good morning, your Honor, Gail
     Shifman on behalf of defendant, Stephanie Stockwell, who
13
14
     is present to my right.
15
           THE COURT: And good morning, Ms. Shifman. May I
16
     address her about having read the presentence report?
17
           MS. SHIFMAN: Yes, your Honor.
18
           THE COURT: Ma'am, have you read the presentence
19
     report that has been prepared in your case?
20
           THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor.
21
           THE COURT: And have you talked it all over with
     your counsel?
22
23
           THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor.
24
           THE COURT: And do you think you understand it?
25
           THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Nothing's been withheld from the presentence report under the rules of criminal procedure?

PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

Sentencing in this session of the court proceeds in four steps. The first three steps are largely arithmetic. Excuse me. And first I calculate the highest sentence that would be open to the court under the Constitution. Then I consult the average sentences imposed for offenses of this sort. Third, I accurately calculate the sentencing guidelines as required by the law. If anyone would differ from any of the arithmetic that I go through, I ask you to interrupt me and I will, um, seek to address it at that time.

I understand that there are victims who wish to speak?

MR. KOSTO: There are, your Honor, David and Ina Steiner are both in the courtroom this morning and would like to speak.

THE COURT: And that is their right and the Court would be happy to entertain that. And the order, we'll do the arithmetic, the victims will speak, and then we'll turn to counsel. I'll hear from the government, I'll hear from the defense, I'll hear from Ms. Stockwell

if she wishes to be heard from. 1 2 MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor. 3 MR. KOSTO: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: That's how we'll proceed. 4 5 This Court considers that the highest sentence in 6 our quasi-determinate sentencing system which it might impose is the top of the applicable guideline range 8 without regard to any, um, mitigating factor, subject of 9 course to the statutory maximum. 10 In this case, without the discount for the --11 without the discount for the guilty plea, that would 12 take the level to a level -- excuse me. I misspoke. 13 Yes, that would take it to a Level 22, the top of the applicable guideline at this criminal history is 51 14 15 months, that is within the statutory range and that is 16 the highest sentence the Court could impose. 17 MS. SHIFMAN: Your Honor, if I may? 18 THE COURT: You may. 19 MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you. We filed an objection to 20 the two-level increase for a pattern of activity, um, as 21 applicable to each victim group. I don't want to really 22 spend too much time on it, your Honor, it's contained 23 within our memorandum. 24 THE COURT: I've read your memorandum and this is

absolutely the time to raise it because it really will

25

affect the calculation which I must make and that drives the highest possibility. Now while the highest possibility is somewhat academic, I'll hear you.

MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, we don't believe that the pattern of activity enhancement is applicable to Ms. Stockwell for the following reasons. Her course of conduct in this offense is exactly what the two-level increase for pattern is attempting to enhance the guidelines, we believe it's double-counting. And based on Ms. Stockwell's role in the offense and what was reasonably foreseeable to her and to her actual activities in this offense, we do not believe that there is the extended pattern of activity that the First Circuit itself would define as making this guideline applicable.

Ms. Stockwell, um, has fully accepted responsibility for her conduct in this offense and what she did was, um, participate on occasion at the direction of her immediate supervisor, Jim Baugh, in the sending of harassing deliveries to the victims here. That occurred at his direction and generally and usually at his selection of what to send on a couple of occasions over the course of, for her activity, about one week. And at the time of the offense, Ms. Stockwell

herself was not aware of the activities of others in the case, though she did, and I don't want to misrepresent this, she did understand that harassing deliveries were being sent to the victims here.

With regard to the obstruction, Count 2, she has admitted her role in that offense, and pled guilty to it, and her obstructive conduct is not a separate, um, course of conduct within the harassing cyberstalking statute that we believe is applicable for this enhancement. With that I will submit it, your Honor, along with what we contained in our memo.

THE COURT: Thank you. I should have said that I have read all of the materials that have been submitted.

Mr. Kosto, what do you say?

MR. KOSTO: Firstly, your Honor, with both the government and Ms. Stockwell, um, submitting recommendations that, for reasons you'll hear and have read about, are substantially below the otherwise applicable guidelines in this case, we don't think it's one that the Court needs to reach, whereas in other cases in this group there will be full briefing and a record on this. But since the Court has an obligation to calculate the guidelines correctly in every case, looking at the pattern of activity enhancement under 2(a)(6.2)(B)(i)(e), it applies when the offense involves

a pattern of harassment, stalking, and threatening, and the definition in the application notes of a pattern of activity is given as an example, an instance of harassment accompanying by an instance of stalking, essentially accompanied by an instance of threatening, which is exactly what the conduct entailed here, there were packages, there was surveillance, and there were threatening messages. Ms. Stockwell need not be the participant in each of those things or the offense to involve that pattern. She did participate in the brainstorming and sending of the harassing packages and was aware that surveillance was ongoing as she prepared paperwork that would support the surveillance team in case they were pulled over by the police.

So under those circumstances the application note gives the sense that probation got it correctly here. And I think just as a practical sense, an offense that involves three different kinds of harassment, stalking, and threatening, is a more serious one and certainly more serious, as the Court will hear. As the victims experienced it, each of those kinds of harassment, stalking, and threatening amplified the other. And so when the packages are arriving and then a threatening message comes and says, somewhat vulgarly, "Did you get my gifts?" It enhances the fear that the victims

experience. So under those circumstances it makes sense to punish a multipronged campaign more seriously that one that involves one kind of harassment.

THE COURT: The Court so rules, the objection is overruled, and the enhancement is part of the calculation here.

I said that I look at the publicly-available databases. This is the first time that this Court has, um, sentenced for the, um, conspiracy to commit cyberstalking, but the United States Sentencing Commission has a very helpful computer program that gives me the average sentences nationwide for those offenders in Criminal History Category 1 who have committed that crime, and the average -- there are 42 such offenders and the average length of imprisonment has been 30 months.

Now the Court turns to calculating the sentencing guidelines, as it must, and as the law requires.

The base offense level here is 18. The Court does enhance by 2 levels considering the totality of the circumstances. The Court however goes down two levels because Ms. Stockwell was a minor participant. The Court adds in two levels again for obstruction of justice. To give an adjusted offense level of 20.

Count 2 works out exactly the same way. So each

```
count has an adjusted offense level of 20, which results
1
     in increasing the total combined offense level to 22.
 2
 3
           The Court then goes down three levels to 19
     because of the guilty plea.
 4
 5
           So that gives us a range of -- under the
     guidelines of 30 to 37 months, a period of supervised
 6
     release of not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, a fine
8
     of not less than $10,000 or more than $100,000, and
     there must be a $200 special assessment.
 9
           THE COURT: Are the guideline properly calculated
10
11
     in the eyes the government?
12
           MR. KOSTO: Yes, they are, your Honor.
           THE COURT: And, Ms. Shifman, I understand you
13
14
     take issue with it in the manner that we've discussed.
15
     I've overruled that and saved your rights.
16
           Is there anything else that I should consider in
     making the guideline calculation?
17
           MS. SHIFMAN: No, your Honor.
18
19
           THE COURT: Very well. All right, those are the
20
     quideline calculations.
21
           And I am certainly open to hearing from the
     victims.
22
23
           MR. KOSTO: Thank you, your Honor. It looks like
24
     Ms. Steiner will speak first.
25
           THE COURT: Yes.
```

```
MR. KOSTO:
 1
                       Thank you.
 2
           (Pause.)
 3
           THE COURT: You don't have to stand, this business
     of standing is a convention in the court, but I've been
 4
 5
     in courts where they don't, and you are welcome.
 6
           MR. STEINER: Much appreciated.
 7
           THE COURT: Neither one of you need stand, though
8
     you are welcome to stand.
9
           He suggested that Ms. Steiner would speak first,
     but I don't care if you want to --
10
11
           MR. STEINER: No, sir, I'd like to speak first.
12
           THE COURT: You may.
13
           MR. STEINER: Thank you. My name is David
14
     Steiner, I'm Victim Number 2.
15
           I admit that of all the victim impact statements
16
     that I've written to date, this has been one of the most
17
     difficult.
           I understand youthful ignorance, I realize it is
18
19
     not fair to judge a person by their worst day. That
20
     said, Defendant Stockwell had a lot of bad days in 2019.
21
     Not only did she fully conspire to threaten and harass
22
     Ina and myself, but she also helped prepare a fake
23
     dossier which painted us as "persons of interest" to
24
     present to police in the event they were caught
25
     surveilling us. She prepared a list of innocent people
```

to pin the teams' crimes on. Her bad decisions continued even after her fellow defendants were caught. She accepted \$5,000 from Jim Baugh to mislead investigators. Her actions were egregious, incomprehensible, and dangerous. Should she have known better? Absolutely. To willingly go along with this obviously harmful and illegal group think shows an absence of any type of moral compass.

There was a victim on the other side of the threatening texts and disturbing deliveries that you sent, one of the most compassionate, caring people you could ever hope to encounter. 34 years ago she agreed to become my wife and has made me the most fortunate person I know. This is who you attacked.

Not only did you threaten and intimidate a dedicated journalist whose sole mission was to help online sellers, the customers of the very corporation you've worked for. You've wounded and unalterably changed the most precious person in my life.

At one time I could make Ina laugh until she could barely catch her breath, I loved to entertain her so that I could hear that infectious laugh. I haven't heard it in more than 3 years and I miss it. This is something you have stolen from me.

You made some very bad choices in your life so

far. You may have been groomed to believe that these choices were acceptable, but every day that we deal with the fallout from your choices was another day that's been stolen. You may not appreciate it yet but time becomes more valuable with age. I don't want to spend the rest of my life on this planet hating you or even thinking about you, I want to spend it surrounded by the people I love without the specter of your despicable crimes hanging over me.

I'm not at a place yet where I can forgive. I hope to be someday, not for your sake, but for others and mine. Maybe that's when I'll know when I've fully-healed. But that's a long way off.

This is a time for accountability as the Court sees fit. I sincerely hope that whatever sentence the Court imposes, that in the not-to-distant future Ina and I can look back and feel that we got a bit more closure and you can look back and see that it was fair. To accept responsibility for your actions and come out a better person is all on you.

I want to thank the Court for listening and considering my words.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Steiner.

MS. STEINER: Thank you, your Honor. Can you hear

me?

THE COURT: I can.

MS. STEINER: My name is Ina Steiner, I am Victim
1.

Every day I deal with the fallout from what happened to me in 2019 and today is one more challenge. Like everything about this situation I have more questions than answers including about the people who participated in the campaign.

According to the government affidavit, defendant Stockwell created false dossiers painting David and myself as threats to eBay executives. She sent disturbing and threatening deliveries to our home and was aware of the terror she was inflicting.

On August 20th, 2019, co-defendant Jim Baugh sent defendant Stockwell a recording of one of our frantic 911 calls to the Natick Police with a note, "A little glimpse of what all your hard work has led to." The same day Baugh sent Stockwell a link to a movie in which a character arrived at a home unannounced and says, "I'm here for the gang bang." And later that day Baugh messaged Stockwell, "We've burned two of our rental cars by following them, now they are seeing ghosts thinking everyone is following them and they call the police every 10 minutes," referring to us.

Two days later Baugh told Stockwell, "The cops traced the gift card from the pizza delivery back to the Safeway in Santa Clara. Defendant Stockwell knew the emotional distress we were experiencing and that there was a criminal investigation by the Natick Police.

At 25 years old she was inexperienced, she was also the manager of eBay's global intelligence center making \$120,000 a year. She fired an intelligence analyst in her department for refusing to participate in the scheme to terrorize us. Defendant Stockwell, when caught, obstructed the investigation, had sexual relations with her former boss, and accepted a \$5,000 cash bribe from him in exchange for lying to federal prosecutors. I was stunned that the prosecutor's office deemed fit to recommend 0 prison time for a defendant who committed cruel crimes, obstructed the investigation, and then lied directly to federal prosecutors. What message does that send about the consequences of her actions?

I wish I was --

THE COURT: What do you recommend?

MS. STEINER: Pardon me?

THE COURT: What do you recommend?

MS. STEINER: Your Honor, this is the 4th

sentencing hearing that I've attended and had to give a

victim impact statement to, it's the first where a defendant was not recommended prison time. Excuse me.

David and I had had many conversations and we never can calculate what the right sentence should be.

O prison time for somebody who did this, I just don't know what message that sends to people. Cyberstalking is just a growing problem and they need to know that.

And I don't know because I don't have -- I didn't even -- I wasn't even allowed to see the sentencing recommendation memoranda.

Defendant Stockwell's sentencing memorandum was filed this morning, so I don't know who this person is. You have much more insight. So I think that might answer your question, your Honor.

THE COURT: It does indeed.

MS. STEINER: Okay, thank you.

appreciate what you say and I say in all candor, in every sentence that this Court imposes I do not know with precision the appropriate sentence. It's a difficult responsibility. You made the point that you don't think it should be a no-jail time sentence and it was only for that reason that I interrupted. That's a very candid and helpful response.

It is my responsibility. I can tell you I take it

very seriously. Please go ahead.

MS. STEINER: I thank you, your Honor, and I would not want to be in your chair this morning.

I wish I was a detached observer, someone reading an article in the newspaper instead of a victim standing before you today deeply traumatized by what the defendant did to my husband and me.

Thank you so much, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Kosto, I'll hear you. I have read everything that's before me. For reasons that are fully satisfactory to the government you have, as has the defendant, filed your sentencing memoranda under seal.

I'll respect that in anything I say. So let's have that in mind when you argue.

Do you understand?

MR. KOSTO: I do, your Honor. We placed a redacted version of the government's sentencing memorandum on the dockets that explains the rationale for the sentence in large part, but it should be available to the public.

THE COURT: And since you've done that, it will be in that form. I'll hear you.

MR. KOSTO: Thank you.

And I guess the first question, your Honor, is

```
1
     that the government did file the motion in connection
 2
     with that submission. May we assume that it's allowed
 3
     and then speaking --
           THE COURT: The motion is allowed.
 4
 5
           MR. KOSTO: Thank you.
           So, your Honor, the government is asking the Court
 6
 7
     to impose a sentence of 2 years probation with the first
8
     year to be served in home confinement in the Northern
 9
     District of California and the required $200 special
10
     assessment.
11
           THE COURT: A fine?
12
           MR. KOSTO: I'm sorry?
           THE COURT: A fine?
13
14
           MR. KOSTO: The government is not seeking a fine
15
     in light of the financial condition described in the
16
     presentence investigation report --
17
           THE COURT: Thank you.
           MR. KOSTO: -- which appears to show that the
18
19
     defendant does not have an ability to pay a fine.
20
           THE COURT:
                       Thank you.
21
           MR. KOSTO: This is a crime, your Honor, that
     started behind a keyboard from 3,000 miles away. It
22
23
     wasn't violent in the sense of many cases that come
24
     before the Court for sentencing, but it had the same
25
     kind of effect on the victims who you've just heard
```

from, and I think it's plainly apparent that it gave them real-world symptoms, nausea, sweating, fear of the loss of a loved one.

There were moments in this case that had been described to the government that include, um, the victims putting a pile of dish ware and things that make noise up against the back door of their home while this was all going on so that if someone attempted to break in they would know about it and be able to take steps. The consequences of these actions do linger to this day, I'm sure you've heard it in the victims's voices as they address the Court.

What was needed in this case, your Honor, was a speck of decency when this all started, the recognition that people want to be treated or should be treated in the way that they want to be treated themselves, notwithstanding the fact that a lot of this took place online. That's an illustration of the power that technology has in our lives. And at every level of culpability in this case, each of the defendants, including Ms. Stockwell, failed the victims and broke the law.

What we're trying to do in these sentences and these recommendations, your Honor, is assess the level of culpability of each of the defendants and provide or

recommend a sentence that has sanctions but still acknowledges where they fall within the gamut of responsibility.

THE COURT: I respect that. I have -- and you're framing it, as of course you must, with respect to the cyberstalking statute. I have to say that I was struck in reading all these materials that here we have indisputably corporate agents, however illegal and misguided, trying to suppress speech, that is the goal. I mean correct me if you think -- yes, I think this case has implications that go well beyond the harm to these victims and the wisdom of the Congress in enacting a statute which is consonant with today's reality.

But I am struck that here they -- and I'm not making any choices about who was indicted or any reflections, it's not before me and I do not speak to it, I speak only to the people -- to the person -- to the persons that are before me, and of course I have knowledge of the others indicted. But the whole idea here was to suppress a precious right.

Are you going to address that?

MR. KOSTO: We did in our memorandum, your Honor.

The idea that the Steiners were targeted for the content of eCommerce speech is something that adds to the seriousness of the offense.

THE COURT: I would say so.

MR. KOSTO: The mechanism that was chosen, I think we've said, is abhorrent to First Amendment values, the content of the messages. "No more posts about eBay," fill in vulgarity at the appropriate moment. One can't reach the conclusion, whatever the defendants were saying at the time, about "Oh, there's a security risk here," that they were out to change the content of what the Steiners were writing about eBay. That enhances the seriousness of the offense.

But the Court does need to, I think appropriately, try to -- and I should say that absent the motion we filed and absent some of the factors that Ms. Shifman has highlighted in her memorandum, this would indisputably be a prison case. And we have so recommended in each of the four sentencings that have -- excuse me, in each of the three sentencings that have taken place and will recommend it in some of the sentencings that follow, that a custodial sentence would be appropriate.

Judge Saris responded to a request of home confinement in the Harville case a few weeks back with a defendant who was significantly more culpable than

Ms. Stockwell by characterizing that request as "widely inappropriate." But what we're trying to do with the

benefit of the motion we filed for Ms. Stockwell is to thread a needle that addresses the range of conduct and that starts with Mr. Baugh, who received a 57-month sentence from Judge Saris. I don't think there's any dispute across -- from the victims, from the government, from Ms. Shifman, from the other defense lawyers in the case, that Mr. Baugh was disproportionately culpable, he was the motivating force and originator of the conduct. And although the government isn't familiar with the specific anecdotes that Ms. Shifman describes in her memo about how Mr. Baugh ran the Securities Department, it's consistent with the government's understanding of how Mr. Baugh ran the Securities Department at eBay. So he's in a spot that the Court can look at for relative culpability.

There's a group of defendants that the government would, um -- a list to include Ms. Popp, who the Court will sentence later today, Mr. Harville, the former military police officer, and Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Cook, two former police captains with decades of experience in law enforcement who form the middle range of culpability, and they've received sentences of between 18 and 24 months, with Mr. Gilbert pending sentencing and a guideline sentencing range anticipated to be 30 to 37 months.

And then in the next group, your Honor, we have Ms. Stockwell and Ms. Zea, who this Court will sentence in November as well, the newest of the employees at eBay, ones who, in the government's assessment of the conduct were dispatched to do things and told to do things and does them. It doesn't eliminate their culpability, it mitigates it. So if Ms. Stockwell is told, "Go to BestBuy, buy a computer, pay cash," and that computer is then used to send the harassing messages, "Send me a license plate for the victim's car," "Make me a document that label the Steiners as a security threats," "Send these deliveries," "Stop these deliveries," "Start them again," you get a sense for where this defendant falls within the range of the defendants involved in the conspiracy.

Ms. Stockwell knew what this was for, I think the Steiners alluded to the audio recordings and the videos that Mr. Baugh was peppering his co-defendants and co-conspirators with, it was understood what the harassment was for. And then even beneath Ms. Stockwell and Ms. Zea, you have two other individuals that the government has alluded to named "Analyst 1" and "Analyst 2" who quit and got fired rather than participate, rather than do what they were told.

With the benefit of the motion we've filed, your

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Honor, where we come down with -- where we come down on Ms. Stockwell is that a noncustodial sentence is not appropriate, but that a straight probationary sentence similarly or relatedly minimizes the outside impact that her conduct and the conduct of her co-conspirators had, however she was motivated. I mean some crimes are serious enough to merit some lesser deprivation of liberty.

It's a legitimate question, in the absence of the motion the government's filed, why the government would not be seeking a custodial sentence. We differ slightly with Ms. Shifman in that we think some sanction, some deprivation of liberty in the form of home confinement that recognizes Ms. Stockwell's unique -- relatively unique role in the crime and her physical and mental health and that, um, those factors role in the crime, um, that would be a sentence that would allow her to work, that would allow her to address those mental and physical needs, that would allow her to continue to engage in community service, but would not be the least of the sanctions that the Court could impose. Because at bottom, your Honor, this is not a case in which any defendant should be receiving the least of the sanctions the Court could impose whatever well-earned benefits the defendant did receive as a result of her actions

```
following, um, her involvement coming to light.
 1
 2
           THE COURT:
                       Thank you.
 3
           MR. KOSTO: So those are the reasons, your Honor.
           THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
 5
           Ms. Shifman.
 6
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
 7
           THE COURT: And again your memorandum is under
     seal and I respect that. But I thank you for it.
8
           MS. SHIFMAN: Your Honor, I believe there's also a
 9
     redacted memo on the public record.
10
11
           So thank you for this opportunity. On behalf of
12
     Ms. Stockwell, I want to first begin by saying that what
13
     happened in that unit, that security unit at eBay and at
14
     eBay generally was despicable. There is on behalf of
15
     Ms. Stockwell, her individually, a heartfelt
16
     understanding and complete distress at the harm that was
17
     caused to Mr. and Mrs. Steiner individually,
     collectively, and that they have to experience still
18
19
     today.
           THE COURT: Well when did she come to that
20
     realization?
21
22
           MS. SHIFMAN: Your Honor, what makes, um,
23
     Stephanie -- if I may call her "Stephanie"? What makes
24
     her unique in the context of this crime is that -- and
25
     I'm going to lay out who she is individually, her
```

characteristics, is that she suffers from a neurological disability, autism spectrum disorder. She is autistic. At the time that she worked at eBay, um, when she was 25, she had not yet been diagnosed with that disability. She also suffers from mental health disorders, ADHD, an anxiety disorder, and a depressive disorder.

She knew that something was wrong with her, she masked it, she mimicked others, she followed directions, she acted while at eBay in accordance with the characteristics of someone who suffers from autism. She at that time did not have the mental wherewithal, if you will, to be able to resist the grooming and predatory actions of Jim Baugh and Stephanie Popp.

Jim Baugh --

THE COURT: Wait. Wait a minute. If that were all so, then under the guidelines there are bases for reducing the sentence. I recognize what's been said here. But on the one hand you say the conduct is despicable, but I'm starting with the -- I'm starting with the proposition that she had the mental wherewithal to form the necessary intent to commit the crimes of conspiracy. Are you saying she didn't have it?

MS. SHIFMAN: No, I'm not, your Honor, I don't believe that it rises fully to the level of a defense.

If I believed that we would not have come forward to

plead guilty, she would not have come forward to reveal her participation in the offense. And I do believe that, um, under the sentencing statute, 3553, that these are factors that are highly-mitigating, they offer unique characteristics.

And since the commission of this offense -- and I will say, your Honor, that when I first met

Ms. Stockwell and had the opportunity to interview her and watch her answer questions, I realized in short order that something was amiss. That is how the path to obtaining her full diagnosis began. And since she has been diagnosed, she has, on her own, without Court order, undertaken an extensive exploration of what this disability means for her individually and the best path to ensure that she never finds herself incapable, in an environment like eBay, not to walk away and do the right thing.

And at the time Ms. Stockwell was operating as someone with autism might, which is to look around, see what others were doing, try to just mimic what they were doing and follow orders. I'm not saying it was right, it was criminal, she understands that she should have made other choices and she deeply regrets that she wasn't doing that at that time.

And in short order, um, she began the process and

-- which continues to today, and you've seen that in the letter of Dr. Martin, which is our first, Exhibit B, and also in the psychological report of Dr. Walsh, which is our sealed Exhibit A, that she has undertaken every necessary step to ensure that she remains a good citizen and a significant contributor to the community.

And I think it is clear when you read not only the psychological reports and the letter -- and the letters from her family, but also when you read the two letters of her direct employers, she was lucky enough within the last year to finally find employment, and the CEO of her company and her direct supervisor write about Stephanie's "moral compass," how she has from the inception, during the first interview, revealed what she did in this case to ensure that she was being honest and making full disclosures and ensuring that she brought no harm to her employer, those people she worked with, or any of the customers or clients of the company themselves.

She is today a completely different person than she was in 2019. In the last three years she has undergone a post-offense rehabilitation the type or the sort that the Court would hope for at the conclusion of a sentence, but she has done that on her own prior to sentencing.

It is appropriate here, we believe, and that's why she pled guilty, that this criminal offense follows her around, it is a lifelong, um, stigma, it will infect her for the rest of her life, but it also enabled her to make the kinds of changes that we want for people living in the community. I know, from representing

Ms. Stockwell for the last three-plus years, that her heart felt remorse for her actions that contributed to this offense and its impact on the Steiners.

Jim Baugh ran a predatory department and he was a predator directly to Stephanie. He not only subjected her to psychological terror in the running of the department itself claiming that they were doing armed and active shooter drills on a regular basis, subjecting them to psychological breakdown and rebuilding, telling them they were worthless if they couldn't keep up, but he also lured her into a -- I'm just going to say what it was, unconsentual sex on a number of occasions, including doxing her drink in order to have sex with her and calling himself her "Dad" as well. For someone with her disability and mental health disorders, at the time it was just too much.

Would that happen to Stephanie today, would she participate? No, she would not. She is in a completely different understanding of how she needs to reach for

help, both doing active work herself and reaching to those she knows support her so that she doesn't find herself in this position again.

We believe that under 3553, in addition to the offense, in addition -- and we appreciate everything that Mr. and Mrs. Steiner said today, and we understand it. We do. But we believe, given her unique characteristics, the collateral consequences, the post-offense rehabilitation, her need to continue her journey to ensure her stability, both with her disability and her mental health disorders, her need to and her desire to contribute to the community as an alternative sanction for community service work, that the lack of need for specific deterrence -- I don't think anyone thinks that Stephanie will find herself in a criminal law position ever again, but also as a general deterrence for someone like Stephanie who is intelligent. Her autism --

THE COURT: Well I would think that this is a case that cries out for general deterrence.

MS. SHIFMAN: Yes, your Honor, and there is that deterrence. By the fact that despite her disability and despite her mental health disorder and despite her significantly more, compared to the other conspirators role, and her minor role in the offense, that she will

carry the burden of two felony convictions for the rest of her life.

It has impacted her employment opportunities and she's a young woman who needs to work, she needs to be able to financially support herself, and she carries that, and that is a large general deterrent to those who might encounter the rogue predatory actions of a corporate agent and its direct supervisors. And we think the combination of that, um, and all the other factors we've raised in our sentencing memo, mitigate substantially here for a probationary sentence.

And that if the Court is contemplating any home confinement, that it be a lesser amount of time than what the government recommends. We believe that a year of home confinement would be detrimental to her mental health and to her abilities to properly care for --

THE COURT: How so? That seems a rather sensitive recommendation to me. If she's able to work, attend medical appointments, attend religious, um, expressions, um, and take care of the necessities of life, one would think that that was a very sensitive sentence.

MS. SHIFMAN: And we appreciate the recommendation of the government, your Honor.

One important part of her treatment plan includes, um, strenuous physical activity in the outdoors, in the

1 open space, for her well-being, and I believe that a 2 home confinement sentence, if it's imposed, your Honor, 3 we would ask that that be allowed as a part of her treatment plan, with the prior approval of the probation 4 5 department, because if that is not included, we believe 6 that would be detrimental to her physical and mental well-being. THE COURT: I understand, that's a little 8 different. 9 Thank you very much. 10 11 MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Stockwell, you have the right to 12 talk to me directly. You're not required to. If you 13 14 want to, I'll hear you now. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you. 16 (Stands at podium.) 17 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. If I need 18 to speak up, please let me know. 19 THE COURT: I can hear you. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 21 Your Honor, my involvement in these events and my 22 conduct during the investigation are, without a doubt, 23 the lowest points in my life. I am overwhelmed with 24 shame and guilt at my actions (cries.) for the impact 25 that this has had on my family and my loved ones, and

for most of all, um, how my part in these events, in the actions of the people that I worked with, affected Mr. and Mrs. Steiner. The actions that I took part in -- (cries.) I'm sorry, they ranged from immature to cruel, and at the time I didn't consider the weight of those actions and the undeniable impact that they've had, um, and for this I'm so so sorry.

When I found out the full extent of what

Mr. Baugh, Ms. Popp, and others had planned and done, I

was appalled. I realized that this is not just pranks

to distract from the publishing of a blog, um, as had

been originally described to me, um, and in which I

originally believed about it, it was in fact stalking

and harassment, and, um, through my actions and

involvement I helped make that happen.

When I read the initial draft of the Steiners's victim impact letters, um, describing everything that they endured and their terrible experience in that time in August, I got physically nauseous and sick to my stomach reading some of the messages that they had been sent, um, and just thinking about what those actions had put them through and the impact that this has had on their lives. I don't think that my words will be enough and I'm not sure that my apology to them will be either. But may I address them?

THE COURT: You may speak in the courtroom, of course.

(Turns around.)

THE DEFENDANT: I'm so so sorry for the impact that this has had on you, for my actions, and my thoughts go out to you for what happened on this. No one deserves to go through what both of you have. And I know it can't be easy for you to have to relive this over and over again. And I hope that you're able to get through this with some closure and get the peace that you need.

(Turns back.)

THE DEFENDANT: This offense, the charges, and everything that has happened has truly shaken me to my core in the past three years, there hasn't been a day that this hasn't weighed on my mind and my conscience, um, it has impacted every aspect of my life and is going to shape much of my future as well. I have struggled greatly with my actions and my involvement is this case, I have had to come to terms with the fear and suffering I've caused people I've never met, um, who did nothing wrong, and that guilt is something that I will always have. I have also struggled and worked to understand how I came to be involved in cyberstalking, harassment, and obstructing justice, um, as my actions and conduct

in 2019 are so far from the person that I want to be. Therapy has been immensely helpful in processing this and making meaningful changes.

Another huge key in coming to terms with this came with my diagnosis of autism in early 2020. While it didn't come entirely out of the blue, I hadn't really thought about the potential that I might be autistic too much, I didn't understand what it meant and how it could impact me, and I want to share this here as not an excuse, because there's no excuse for any actions, but to hopefully provide some context, um, because better understanding my autism and the limitations that come with it have made me better equipped to make the significant life changes that will help to make sure that I'm never in this situation again.

I've learned that autism for me it makes my social cognition, my ability -- excuse me, um, (Cries.) to read between the lines, um, to understand the motivations of others, and to understand unsaid information or cues very difficult. Prior to knowing that I'm autistic and understanding what limitations I have, as a result I generally accepted what people told me at face value. It didn't occur to me that someone might not be telling the truth or might have an ulterior motive. Knowledge of this has helped explain a lot of the manipulation

I've endured in my past and it's also been critical in understanding of how I was manipulated by my supervisors during my time at eBay. And again this is not an excuse, um, but it was a critical realization for me that has allowed me to make some really drastic changes in my life.

Realizing and acknowledging these limitations has been huge. Now I'm aware that I must be cautious about making judgments, um, in who I trust, and I have people in my life now who can help me work through those issues when I'm not sure about a course of action. I've built up a strong group of support people in my life who I know I can trust, um, and with whom I can regularly check in on decisions and interactions that I'm not sure about. And that's been a big change. In acknowledging that I need this support, I have been able to have more accountability in my life, I've been better able to consider the potential impacts and consequences of my decisions and actions, and I've also been able to feel more safe and secure in the aftermath of the mess I made of my life.

During the time that I worked at eBay, I was extremely isolated, I had no such support or awareness, um, of my autism and the impact that it had on my understanding of things. At the time I had a distant

relationship with my family and all of my regular interactions and friendships and support were in that group list that I worked with at eBay. I saw Mr. Baugh as a mentor and a father figure and had only ever assumed that he had my best interests at heart, and knowing what I now know, um, and given everything that had happened, that thought makes me really sick. I have spent a lot of time in therapy both devastated and terrified that I could put so much trust in someone like him.

Since then, with the help and guidance of my loved ones and therapist, I have worked hard to create an environment and develop tools where I'm better able to recognize potentially dangerous situations and have the courage and agency to step away. I've also worked on understanding and having boundaries and have gained a better understanding of what should be expected of an appropriate work environment, and I have done a great deal of reflection on the type of person that I want to be and the life that I want to live and the impact that I want my life to have moving forward.

Despite having gone to school for years with hopes of working in security and intelligence, I left that industry and have no intention of ever returning. I wanted to work in security to help people and to make

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

people feel safe and I don't think I could have messed

that up more. I've taken classes and training to gain the necessary skills to work in other fields, um, and have worked for the past year at a small company supporting their business functions and conservation clients. I care a lot about the work that I do, but I also realize that family, both the one that I have and the one that I would like to build someday, and community, are the most important parts of my life. I've reevaluated my values and realize that all of my choices, goals, and the people I associate with should reflect those values, and these include honesty and integrity, kindness, transparency, in actions as well as in giving back to the community. I've learned to ask, "Could this hurt somebody? Is this person telling me the truth?" and I've learned that it's okay to walk away and say "No." While all the work that I've done, um, has changed

While all the work that I've done, um, has changed the way that I live my life now, I know that nothing can undue my actions in 2019 or the lasting impact that this has had on those people involved and impacted, particularly Mr. and Mrs. Steiner, and I would like to one more time offer them my sincerest apology and thank them for this time today because I know that it's difficult for them. I would also like to thank my

family for their support and love, it's been crucial for me, and I apologize to them as well.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration, your Honor.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Ms. Stephanie Stockwell, pursuant to provisions of 18 United States Code, Section 3553(a), the information from the United States Attorney, your attorney, the probation officer, and yourself, this Court sentences you to 2 years of probation. The first year of probation will be spent in home confinement at a residence approved by the probation office.

You will be permitted to leave home confinement for the purposes of employment, attending any medical appointments or counseling, any religious observances, for the purpose of shopping for necessities such as food and clothing. I am sensitive to what your attorney has argued and the business about strenuous physical activity and should your treating physician recommend such a regimen, it is open to the supervising probation office to permit you to engage in such activity. Other than that you'll be in that residence. This is home confinement. If you violate those terms, the Court will have little choice but to send you to prison.

They'll be no fine due to your inability to pay a

fine. They'll be the \$200 special assessment as required by the law. This is the sentence on each count of the conviction, the sentence on each count runs concurrent, one with the other. Let me explain this to you.

The activities of this group are nothing short of disgusting and appalling, words do not encompass it.

What the record that this Court has before it -- the record that this Court has before it shows a deliberate attempt to actually suppress speech, to interfere with the constitutional rights of others.

Now the recommendation of the government here has been extraordinarily sensitive. The sentence is my responsibility. I adopted the government's recommendation, but the sentence is my responsibility. Make no mistake, were it not for the motion the government filed, which I adopted, and were it not for your undoubted condition which you forthrightly set forward here and which the Court recognizes, you'd be going to prison.

The Court imposes upon you all the general and special conditions of probation as they are set forth on Pages 36 through 39 of the presentence report with one addition. There shall be no disparagement of the plea. This Court concludes that you knew very well what you

were admitting to at the time you pled guilty. So while your free speech is not infringed in any way, they'll be no saying "Well I didn't really mean to do these things, I felt I had no choice." You've admitted to these crimes. There's no taking that back. And to disparage the plea is to violate the terms of your probation.

In all honesty I hope I can believe what you've said here today about how you've changed and what your able counsel has said on your behalf about how you've changed. I have taken that into account. I have taken the government's recommendation into account in fashioning this sentence.

Ms. Steiner has it just right, I never know with precision what is the best sentence, ever, but what I do is try to fashion, in accordance with the law, what is the best sentence. It is my responsibility. I consider this a fair and a just sentence, I have no hesitancy in imposing it.

You have the right to appeal from any findings or rulings the Court has made against you. Should you appeal and should your appeal be successful in whole or in part and the case remanded, you'll be resentenced before another judge. Ms. Shifman, if an appeal is decided upon, you want transcript, seek it from this session of the court because I'll turn it around right

```
1
     away.
 2
           Do you understand?
 3
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor. A couple of
     questions.
 4
 5
           Do we need to put on the record the specific
     language that the Northern District of California needs
 6
 7
     for the imposition of home detention?
8
           PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor, I sent
     language to Ms. Gaudet. They require location
 9
10
     monitoring to accept the case of home confinement.
11
           THE COURT: I will so order.
12
           PROBATION OFFICER: Thank you.
13
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
14
           THE COURT: And I thank you, Ms. Shifman.
15
           MS. SHIFMAN: And one other matter, your Honor.
     We will be seeking transfer of supervision to the
16
17
     Northern District of California where she resides.
                                                          I
     just wanted to let the Court know --
18
19
           THE COURT: I'm not surprised. I've read the
20
     papers thoroughly and that's one that makes perfect
21
     sense.
2.2
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
23
           THE COURT: And without detracting from the
24
     sentence, it is a criminal sentence, um, I certainly
25
     hope that in terms of health and well-being
```

```
Ms. Stockwell fares well.
1
 2
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you. We appreciate that.
 3
           And may the special assessment be paid at the
     Clerk's office today?
 4
 5
           PROBATION OFFICER: Yes.
           MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you.
 6
 7
           THE COURT: That's how we'll proceed. All right.
8
     Let me speak with the Clerk.
9
            (Pause.)
           THE COURT: In this matter you may stand in
10
11
     recess. We're calling the next case.
12
            (Pause.)
13
           THE COURT: Oh, I should say, the restrictions
14
     presentence remain in effect until we get this
15
     probationary sentence in effect.
16
           MS. SHIFMAN: Of course. Thank you.
17
           MR. KOSTO: Thank you.
           (Ends, 11:40 a.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do hereby certify that the forgoing transcript of the record is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes, before Judge William G. Young, on Tuesday, October 11, 2022, to the best of my skill and ability. /s/ Richard H. Romanow 10-19-22 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date